



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/921,107	07/31/2001	Kevin P. Headings	108.0008-00000	7091
22882	7590	07/26/2005		
MARTIN & FERRARO, LLP 1557 LAKE O'PINES STREET, NE HARTVILLE, OH 44632			EXAMINER BASHORE, ALAIN L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1762	
DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/921,107

Applicant(s)

HEADINGS ET AL.

Examiner

Alain L. Bashore

Art Unit

1762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-6 and 28-31 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 7-27 in the reply filed on 12-21-04 is acknowledged. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 7-14, 19-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lotvin et al in view of Musmanno et al.

Lotvin et al discloses a method for controlling access to digital media content by a viewer where a database stores accounts required to access the digital media content (col 11, lines 49-64). A processor is programmed to selectively restrict access to the digital media content by said accounts according to content type, viewing times (col 11, lines 59-63; col 14, lines 41-56). The restrictions called "parameters" encompass the broadest meaning for "ratings", as presently claimed by applicant. Selected spending

limits (col 13, lines 41-44) is disclosed. Reports are generated of spending habits and viewing habits (col 9, lines 5-21).

Lotvin et al further discloses creating accounts including creating a record for a primary account and obtaining information about all account holders where linked accounts are created to permit viewing of digital media content (col 7, lines 31-67; col 8, lines 1-13). A form of payment is selected, restriction and assigning identifiers (col 8, lines 53-61).

Lotvin et al not explicitly use the term "sub-accounts".

Musmanno et al discloses sub-accounts (col 1, lines 25-67; col 2, lines 1-4).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include sub-accounts as described in claims 7, 19-22 because of what is taught by Musmanno et al. Musmanno et al teaches importance of separately managing account functions (col 1, lines 47-52).

4. Claim 10 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lotvin et al in view of Musmanno et al as applied to claim 7 and 19 above and further in view of Cragun et al.

Lotvin et al in view of Musmanno et al do not explicitly disclose a system described as a "rating" system.

Cragun discloses a rating system (col 1, lines 22-42; col 6, lines 19-22).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include a rating system because Lotvin et al teaches accessibility access to media according to suitability requirements of children.

5. Claims 15, 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lotvin et al in view of Gerace.

Lotvin et al discloses what is described in the pervious art rejections. Lotvin et al further discloses targeted marketing (col 14, lines 46-47).

Lotvin et al does not disclose placing each of the account holders into a group of account holders sharing at least one characteristic, said characteristic used to determine the content to deliver to the group of account holders. The characteristics include viewing habits and demographics.

Gerace discloses placing each of the account holders into a group of account holders sharing at least one characteristic, said characteristic used to determine the

Art Unit: 1762

content to deliver to the group of account holders where the characteristics include viewing habits and demographics (col 2, lines 24-61).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include placing each of the account holders into a group of account holders sharing at least one characteristic, said characteristic used to determine the content to deliver to the group of account holders, the characteristics include viewing habits and demographics because of what is taught by Gerace. Gerace teaches value in providing information of interest to groups (col 1, lines 6-29; col 2, lines 3-42).

6. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lotvin et al in view of Gerace as applied to claims 15, 17-18 above, and further in view of Musmanno et al.

Lotvin et al in view of Gerace does not explicitly use the term "sub-accounts".

Musmanno et al discloses sub-accounts (col 1, lines 25-67; col 2, lines 1-4).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include sub-accounts as described in claim 16 because of what is taught by Musmanno et al.

Musmanno et al teaches importance of separately managing account functions (col 1, lines 47-52).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Since both Lotvin et al and Musumanno et al both are concerned broadly with account management, the references are considered to be analogous art.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alain L. Bashore whose telephone number is 571-272-6739. The examiner can normally be reached on about 7:30 am to 5:00 pm (Mon. thru Thurs.).

Art Unit: 1762

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Regarding all Class 705 applications, the management contact regarding examination is: Vincent Millin (SPE, art unit 3624) at 571-272-6747.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Alain L. Bashore
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1762